

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/542,779	KAWASAKI ET AL.	

Examiner
Katherine A. Bareford

Art Unit
1792

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Katherine A. Bareford. (3) _____.

(2) Corwin Umback. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 27 February 2008.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1 plus.

Identification of prior art discussed: Hosono and Kuo.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussed outstanding rejections. Proposed amendments would overcome outstanding objections to specification and claims and 35 USC 112 rejections. Discussed amending claims to provide that the deposited film is the crystalline C12A7 material and has the oxygen radical content as claimed. The Examiner suggested clarifying that in the spraying only the surface or the vicinity of the powder is melted as described in the specification, and clarifying why this specific melting pattern provides the claimed oxygen radical content, while others would not and why this would not be expected by the prior art.